B:- 571

App. F. IX-4

Previous References.

1943:44
(S. & A)

File No. A 102-1,3

Serial Nos. 127, 128, 10.1.6

Later References.

A/25-44-21, 22.
L.R. 177-46.1.2

PRESERVED

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. Three

Part B for November 44

SUBJECT

Allegations of Bribery against R.G. Hiriyer IAS

Notes:- P1—27
Corr:- P1—9

To:- The Dist. Es in Mysore.

S.& 2822/A 102-43-1056 dt 22-11-44

--- Directs that he be retired from Service

12/12

2-12-44

A 102 - 43

"A" Telegram dated the 8th Nov' 1943 from Mr. P. H. Gowda of Haribabu making allegations of bribery against one M. Krishnaswamy, Revenue Inspector, Dharamapur Hobli, Hiriyur Taluq.

Minister's orders "Secretary for Deputy Dr. of C.S. for enquiry and report".

Issued 1) D.O. letter no. 3573/A102-43-1&P dt 27.11.43 to the Dr of C.S. in Mysore, Bangalore, forwarding the above telegram in original, for holding an enquiry and submitting a report to Government.

2) Reply dt 10.11.43 to the party Mr. P. H. Gowda Gowda, acknowledge the receipt of his telegram and intimating that the matter is receiving attention.

"B" Letter no. C1-1312/43-44 dt 24.7.44 from the D.T.S. forwarding copies of the reports from the S.D.O. and the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug.

Issued letter no. SO 875/A102-43- dt 7.8.44 to the D.T.S. requesting him to return the original telegram.

Letter no. C1-1312/43-44 dated 11.8.44 from the D.T.S.

"C" returning the original telegram.

Submitted with a Statement containing allegations implicated.

D DC's finding, Punishment ~~recommended for action~~.

The Revenue Inspector has been reverted as clerk in view of his long service of 24 yrs and his pay reduced from Rs 50 to Rs 45/- Rs 30/8

for perusal

2828 (RRS)

Der. Sec. Mss 579

Mem. Cov) The recomm" is too lenient

He may be retired

"D"

Draft letter is put up for approval

8/11

for renewed letter issue

D.C.I. 2017)

Ce
21/11

Issue
22/11

20/11

Issued letter No: SO 2822/A102-03-1056 dated 22.11.44 to the D.T.S. stating that the Rev. Inspector Mr. H.P Kri. Bhima Murthy be retired from service and that the punishment reported is to be revised.

23/11

A102-63-12

OFFICE OF THE MINISTER FOR INDUSTRIES & SUPPLIES
No. 633

B. T. B. INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT. No.

SUPPLY SECRETARIAT

Recd. at 10 H. M. 11 NOV 1943
From
By

Sent at H. M.
To
By

Office Stamp

D. No. 2101

O 12/30 Sirsi 8 Rdtd 7m Blga 47
r/f/d reone M A Srinivasan
Minister For Food. public
Offices Bangalore
Complaints on Krishnamurti RI Bharanapura
Lobbi hiriyur Taluk Taken Rs 60/ Bribe
at Haria bbe on Commandeering Something
In all villages Immediate personal
Enquiry needed urgent give reply
Ph Gundegowda
Haridbbe

Eden Press, Calcutta—No. 129 (5/67) B. (21)—14-10-42—20,000. Bks

P. H. GUNDEGOWDA
HARIABBE,
SIRA.

YOUR TELEGRAM EIGHTH RECEIVING ATTENTION

DEVSEC

8/10/11/43

For Secretary to Government,
Development Dept.(Supplies)

Bangalore,
Dated: 10th Novr., 1943.

KRG.3.

26.11.43.

Appendix F. G.—1]

SUBJECT Allegations against one, Krishna Murthi, Revenue Inspector, Bharamapura hobli, Hiriyur Taluk.

Section A

File No. 102-43

Serial No. 128

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 194 .

Date of issue. **Despatched** 27. 11. 43

Signed by.....

Secy
26/11

W/Adam

SECRETARIAT

43

SU

List of enclosures 1

D. No 3101/43

Codied by.....

Examined by..... W/15/11/43

No. D.O. 3573

To Dear Mr. Raghavendra Rao

I am desired to forward herewith, in original, a telegram dated ~~Eighth~~ November, 1943, from Mr. P.H. Gundegowda of Hariabbe alleging that certain allegations against one Krishnamurthi, Revenue Inspector, Bharmapura hobli, Hiriyur taluk had taken a bribe of Rs 60/- at Hariabbe during Commandeering and to request you to be so good as to hold an enquiry in the matter and submit a report to government as early as possible

Yours Sincerely

Secy
26/11

Secy to Govt
Dev. Deptt
(Supplies)

Sub
15/11

2.

WD C4161—GPB—60,000—24-10-41

To B.S. Raghavendra Rao Esqr ICS (Hd)
Director of C.S. in Mysore
Bangalore.

A102-43-1056

4

C.F. No. 45]

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Telegram/Telephone

OFFICE OF

No. Cl 1312/43-44.
Encls.

the Director of Food Supplies in Mysore, Bangalore.

Date 24 July. 1944.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Development Department (Supplies),
Bangalore.

Sir,

Subject: Allegations against the Revenue Inspector of Dharampur Hobli, Hiriyur Taluk.

With reference to your letter No.3573/A.102-43-128 dated 26/27th November 1943, on the above subject, I have the honour to state that the matter was enquired into by the Sub Division Officer, Chitaldrug and on the basis of his report, the Deputy Commissioner has recorded the following findings.

Allegation.	Deputy Commissioner's finding.
1. That the Revenue Inspector received an illegal gratification of Rs.60/- from the villagers of Hariyabbe.	The allegation cannot be held to have been judicially proved, but there is very strong suspicion in the conduct of the Revenue Inspector in this case.
2. That he did not pay the cost of one palla of ragi to the Patel of Sanjenahalli Village.	The Revenue Inspector has acted in a highly arbitrary and suspicious manner in this case.
3. That he received an illegal gratification of Rs.50/- from one Chikkanna of Lakkavanahalli Village for grant of land under the 'Grow More Food Scheme.'	This is true and is proved.

2. The Sub Division Officer is reported to have recommended that the Revenue Inspector deserves dismissal, but that as a matter of grace, he may be reverted from the executive to the Clerical line permanently and that his pay may be reduced from Rs.50/- to Rs.40/- for a period of one year. The Deputy Commissioner, while agreeing that the official deserves deterrent punishment has, in consideration of his long service of 24 years, ordered that he may be reduced from Rs.50/- to Rs.40/- for a period of two years.

3. A copy of the Deputy Commissioner's letter No.F3.PR.408/43-44 dated 7th July 1944 together with a copy of the enclosure is forwarded herewith for the information of Government.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

DIRECTOR OF FOOD SUPPLIES.

BSG.2

Letter No.F3.PR.408/43-44 dated 7th July 1944, from the Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug District, to the Secretary to Government, Food Supplies in Mysore.

With reference to your D.O.letter No.C1-1812 dated 15th February 1944 forwarding for enquiry and report, copy of letter No.3573/A.102-43-128 dated 26/27th November 1943, I have the honour to state that the allegation against the Revenue Inspector of Dharampur Hobli, Hiriyur, Taluk was enquired into by the Sub Division Officer, Chitaldrug Division. A copy of the final order passed by me in this case is herein enclosed for information.

-Copy-

Enclosure.

Report No.C.C.8/43-44 dated 11th May 1944, from the Sub Division Officer, Chitaldrug.

Order.

1. The first complaint against the Revenue Inspector Mr.M.P.Krishna murthy is that he went to Hariyabbe village and told the villagers that he would commandeer the standing crops and take away to Government as much as was required, that the people did not agree to part with their entire crops by way of commandeering and agreed to supply 60 pallas from the villa as the quota of the village, that the Revenue Inspector demanded Rs.60/- as his mamool if he were to agree to the said quota of 60 pallas and the agreement was reached and the ryots supplied 60 pallas of ragi to the depot and that as agreed to Rs.60/- was paid to the Revenue Inspector Mr.M.P. Krishnamurthy in the Village Panchayat Hall, in the night by H.D.Gundappa. The Sub Division Officer reports that this fact has been corroborated by the witnesses Thimmachar, R.K.Patel, Thirumalaiah, H.D.Gundappa, H.V.Hanumanthe Godwa and Dasanna, that the Revenue Inspector has denied the charge, that this is not acceptable and that the complaint is proved.

2. The witnesses P.H.Gundegowda, Thimmachar, R.K.Patel, B.Thirumalaia and G.Hanumanthiah Patel affirm that Rs.60/- was paid to this Revenue Inspector in the Village Panchayet Hall at night by H.D.Gundappa. H.D.Gundappa says that he did pay this amount. H.V.Hanumanthegowda and Dasanna state that they paid one rupee and eight annas and three rupees respectively to H.D.Gundappa for having supplied 1½ and 3 pallas respectively in accordance with the agreement of supplying 60 pallas and Rs.60/- to the Revenue Inspector. The Revenue Inspector in his statement says that R.K.Patel and Thirumalaiah are Congress members, that Thimmachar and H.D.Gundappa have been convicted in Congress cases, that H.V.Hanumanthe Gowda is a cousin of the Patel, that P.H.Gunde Gowda is the Patel's son and that these witnesses should not be believed.

3. R.K.Patel is a member of the Congress. It is seen from the record C.5/43-44 that he had not given declaration. A Mahazar was drawn for his ragi crop and proper watch was kept over the same on the ground that he was wantonly absenting himself for clandestine removal of the crop.

4. Thirumalaiah is also a Congress member. The Revenue Inspector Mr.M.P.Krishna Murthy had found out that one Narasimhiah brother-in-law of Thirumaliah had unauthorisedly constructed a house on Government land and had taken action for putting up a Thakarar Thakta against him. Thirumaliah says that the incident of the Revenue Inspector takingbribe took place one month back while R.K.Patel who has been examined the same day says that it took place about three months back.

5. Thimmachar is also a Congress member. He had taken part in the Congress programme of cutting date trees and he had been convicted on 28-10-1939 by the First Magistrate, Chitaldrug and sentenced to three months' rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs.100/- or in default to undergo rigorous imprisionment for two months. Upon Fine levy

(P.T.O.)

warrant issued for t[illegible]y of fine amount, the crop of the land belonging to Thimmachar was attached and sold by this Revenue Inspector for the recovery of the balance of the amount. Further action is still being taken

8. M.D.Gundappa is also a member of the Congress. He had also taken part in the cutting of date trees. He admits that he was fined and sentenced to fivemonths' imprisonment, that action is being taken for the recovery of the fine amount and that this Revenue Inspector had himself brought a notice once. In his statement before the Amildar on 9-10-1939 he has stated that he cut the date trees for the purpose of obtaining responsible Government and that he did so under the leadership of Thimmachar who was then the leader of the Congress in Hiriyur. Action is still being taken for the recovery of the value of date trees and fine from him.

7. H.V.Hanumanthegowda is a cousin of the Patel and P.H.Gunde Gowda is the Patel's son. A show cause notice had been issued to the Patel from the Taluk Office on the ground that he was helping the Congress and the Patel had denied the allegation.

8. Witness Dasanna against whom no motive is attributed by the Revenue Inspector says that he did pay Rs.3/- to M.D.Gundappa.

9. There is fairly good corroboration in the evidence of these witnesses in regard to the fact of this Revenue Inspector having taken Rs.60/- as illegal gratification but having regard to the character and antecedents of these witnesses and also the records which are pending against some of them a suspicion arises whether they may not have foisted this allegation against this Revenue Inspector. The allegation cannot be held to have been judicially proved but there is very strong suspicion in the conduct of the Revenue Inspector in this case, in as much as he has taken a lumpsum contribution of grain from the villagers in this case instead of recovering individually from them according to their needs and the grain grown by each of them.

10. The second complaint against this Revenue Inspector is that he took 8 pallas of foodgrains from Adivappa, Patel of Sanjenahalli village, that only Rs.64/- being the cost of 7 pallas were paid to him and that the cost of the remaining one palla is still due to him and that the Revenue Inspector has taken it as his mamool. The Revenue Inspector says that 8 pallas were taken to Aobinahole, that the value of 7 pallas was paid to the complainant, that one palla of ragi was given to Patel Hanumanthegowda of Lidderhere, that Patel Hanumanthe gowda has reported on 5-8-1943 that he paid Rs.9/- to the complainant being the value of the one palla of ragi. In the Sales Register maintained by the Shanbhogue Siva Murthy, it is noted on 2-8-1943 that one palla of ragi has been given to Patel Hanumanthe Gowda. The ink in which it is written appears to be different and this entry appears to be an interlineation. The report dated 5-8-1943 from Patel Hanumanthey Gowda may also have been obtained subsequently. Patel Hanumanthegowda had taken the grain from the Depot. The Revenue Inspector should have paid the cost of the 8 pallas to the complainant and obtained a proper receipt therefor or atleast he should have been that the cost of one palla of ragi was not paid to the complainant and a receipt obtained therefor. Patel Hanumanthe Gowda has neither taken nor produced any receipt for having paid Rs.9/- to the complainant. When he took the ragi from the Depot there was no reason why he should pay the value thereof to the complainant and that, without a receipt. If he had really paid the amount, he would have obtained a receipt from the complainant. The evidence of Patel Hanumanthe Gowda cannot be believed and I find that the Revenue Inspector has acted in a highly arbitrary and suspicious manner in this case.

11. The third complaint against this Revenue Inspector is, that he went to Lakkavanahalli village in Sira Taluk and sent for Mudalappa and informed that he is competent to grant land according to Grow More Food Scheme and got 4 darkhasts for S.No.72 of Kodihalli adjoining village of Hiriyur Taluk and he demanded Rs.100/- from each of the drakhastdars and settlement was reached to pay Rs.50/- each and got Rs.50/- from the complainant Chikkanna and that the Saguvali Chit had not yet come to him.

Mudlappa has supported the complainant in his allegations. The Revenue Inspector states that he did not go to Lakkavvanahalli at all. Chikkanna says that applications were got from Earanna, Junjanna, Siddalingappa and himself. From the Dharkhasts file it is seen that Chikkanna, Eranna, Junja and Siddalingappa have given applications and the Revenue Inspector has noted as though he received them at Venkalagudda on 15-9-1942. On 16-9-1942 he has recorded the Mahazar of Kodihalli villagers regarding the applications for land from Chikkanna, Siddalingappa, Junja and Era. The villagers of Kodihalli have objected to the grant of land saying that the grant of land to people of other villages should be considered after providing land to the needy people of that village. On the same date the Revenue Inspector has also obtained the reports from the Shanbhogue of Changawara saying that these four people have not got sufficient lands and that the land may be given to them and on the same day, this Revenue Inspector has recommended to the Taluk Office for the grant of S.No.72 to these four people of Lakkavvanahalli of Sira Taluk. On 6-10-1942 the record was returned to this Revenue Inspector saying that many people had applied for land in S.Nos.72 and 76 and that the records should be completed in respect of those cases also. On 25-10-1942, the Revenue Inspector has submitted the records saying that the darkhast record is completed so far as S.No. 72 is concerned, thereby suggesting that S.No.72 may be granted to those four people of Sira Taluk. The record was again returned to him on 29-1-1943 and he simply kept it with him for nearly 10 months. The Revenue Inspector has dealt with the applications of those four people in such urgency and has recommended the grant of land to them in such haste, even without preparing Ahaval Thakta in respect of all the persons who had applied for land. The conduct of the Revenue Inspector is highly suspicious. There is no reason why the complainant Chikkanna and Mudlappa should foist a false allegation against this Revenue Inspector. I find that the allegation made by the complainant is true and that it was because he had received this il-legal gratification, he has gone out of the way in recommending this case in such haste to the Taluk Office.

12. In the result, I find that the conduct of this Revenue Inspector is highly suspicious in regard to the allegations that he took Rs.60/- from H.D.Gundappa and that he did not pay the value of one palla of ragi to the Patel of Sanjenahalli. The allegation that he took illegal gratification of Rs.50/- from Chikkanna is proved. He has also ~~xxx~~ behaved in an irregular and arbitrary manner in not getting the value of one palla of ragi paid to the Patel of Sanjenahalli and in taking lumpsum contribution of grain from the villagers of Hariabbe. The Sub Division Officer recommends that this Revenue Inspector deserves dismissal, that as justice has to be tempered with mercy he may be reverted from executive to clerical line permanently and that his pay may be reduced from Rs.50/- to Rs.40/- for a period of one year. The Revenue Inspector deserves a deterrent punishment but considering his long service of 24 years, I order that he may be reduced from Rs.50/- to Rs.40/- for a period of two years.

Sd. A.C.Nirvane Gowda.
Deputy Commissioner, Chitaldrug Dt.

- Copy-

For Director of Food Supplies.

BSG

237.

Appendix F. G.—1]

SUBJECT..... Allegations against the Revenue Inspector, Dharampur Taluka, Hiriyur Taluq.

Despatched

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 194 .

Date of issue.... 7.8.44.....

Signed by.... [signature]

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section A

File No. 102-43

Serial No.

No. 19 875

To

The D. F. S.

in Mysore, B'lore

Sir,—

In inviting reference to your letter no: C1-1312/43-44 & 24.7.44, forwarding a report on the above subject, I am directed to request you to be so good as to return the telegram & 8.11.43, sent with this office D.O. letter no: 3573/A 102-43-128 & 27.11.43

I have etc.

7/8

for Secy to Govt.

Dev. Deptt. (Supplies)

7/8

WD 04:61—GPB—60,000—24-10-41

C. F. No. 45]

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Tele. Trunk phone

No. C.1-1312/43-44 — UPPER SECRETARIAT 11 AUG 1944

Encls. One

OFFICE OF
The Director of Food Supplies
in Mysore, Bangalore.

Date 11th August 1944.

To 25 D No 857/ce

The Secretary to the Government
of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Development Department (Supplies),
Bangalore.

Sir,

Allegations against the Revenue Inspector,
Dharmapur Hobli, Hiriyur Taluk.

With reference to your letter No. S.D.875/A.102-43 dated 7th August 1944 on the above subject, I have the honour to return herewith the telegram dated 8th Nov., 1943 as desired.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Director of Food Supplies.

HSV

11/8/44

G. R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation sheet draft form.*)

Despatched 17/11

No. SS 2822 / A 102-43-1056 dt 22.11.44

To, The Director of Food Supplies
in Mysore, Bangalore

Sir,

Allegations against the Revenue Inspector Dharampur Hobli, Hiriyur Taluk

With reference to your letter no. C1-1312/43-44, dated the 24th Aug, 1944, on the above subject, I am directed to state that the punishment reported to have been ~~given to~~ inflicted on Mr. M. P. Krishna Murthy, Revenue Inspector, Dharampur Hobli, Hiriyur Taluk ~~reverting him permanently~~ reversion from the Executive to the clerical line and ~~reducing~~ reduction of his pay from Rs 50/- to Rs 40/- for a period of two years is too lenient and that he ~~He~~ may be retired from service.

I have etc

21/11

Secy to Govt

WD 0565—GPB—22,500—8-11-38

17/11